

From: J Thompson [mailto:jthomp527@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 5:47 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 SDEIS - Comments

To: Washington Department of Transportation

Subject: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS

I-304-001

I have been opposed to further degradation of the Lake Washington associated wetlands surrounding the 520 Bridge and any lane expansion. My opposition remains. I would like to have the Light rail option given a much more thorough review than it has received to date.

I-304-002

I-304-003

My experience with the traffic and continuous highway construction is mixed. I believe the goals for highway improvements are to at least maintain traffic flow and reduce stop and go traffic on the freeways. It is my opinion that the money spent to date has been wasted. Here are two examples: first my experience with both the Tacoma corridor between SR 512 and Fife is the continued problems of snarled traffic despite the traffic improvements done to that corridor; second, the recent highway construction in Everett from approximately the Everett Mall exit to the Pacific Ave Exit remains just as slow as it was before the construction was begun. It has become my belief that we are through money, which we have little, down a rat hole. Expanding 520 to carry more cars and buses is a failed plan.

I-304-004

I support the Mayor of Seattle's request to use this opportunity to put Light rail on the 520 bridge to increase transportation options. The delay is not significant when compared to the impacts of not using this opportunity to expand the light rail options in the Puget Sound Region. We need to strategically look forward to the future and continually expanding the road system is no longer the answer if it ever was the answer.

Best Regards

Janet Thompson

Janet Thompson, MPA
JTL & Associates
Seattle, WA.
206-365-0057

I-304-001

Comment noted.

I-304-002

Section 2.4 in the Final EIS explains why initial implementation of light rail transit on SR 520 is not planned. The decision to locate Sound Transit's initial east-west light rail transit corridor on I-90 rather than SR 520 has been made through extensive regional deliberation (see Table 2-2 of the Final EIS). Section 2.4 also explains how the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project can accommodate future high capacity transit, such as proposed bus rapid transit or potential future light rail.

I-304-003

Comment noted.

I-304-004

See response to Comment I-301-002. While WSDOT believed that the design of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project already accommodated potential future light rail, the agency worked with the City of Seattle and Sound Transit to identify changes that would enhance the corridor's rail compatibility. The Preferred Alternative reflects these design changes and allows for two potential future rail options, as described in Section 2.4 of the Final EIS.